

REMARKS

Applicants have amended claims 1 and 2 to differently recite the invention. Also, new claims 3-33 have been added to provide for more complete coverage of the invention.

Applicants have not received initialed copies of the 1449 form(s) submitted along with the Information Disclosure Statements dated July 11, 2002 and November 26, 2002. Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to provide such initialed forms in the next communication to be issued by the PTO for this case.

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1 and 2 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kingsley et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,179,284). Applicants traverse the rejections set forth in the pending Office Action, at least for the following reasons.

Applicants submit that Kingsley et al. does not disclose or suggest the combination recited in independent claims 1 and 17 comprising an organic film formed on the top and side surfaces of said scintillator layer and on the portion of the substrate surrounding the periphery (claim 1) or at least a portion of the periphery (claim 17) of said scintillator layer and extending at least partially into the gaps formed between the side surfaces of the columnar crystals of said scintillator layer. In this regard, Kingsley et al. makes reference at column 3, lines 55-59 to a layer 40 that is provided on only a top of scintillator 30. A moisture sealant layer 54, on the other hand, is formed over the whole scintillator. More particularly, moisture sealant layer 54 covers the sides of the scintillator directly and indirectly covers the top of the scintillator through the layer 40.

In contrast, claims 1 and 17, recite an organic film formed on the top and side surfaces of the scintillator and on the portion of the substrate surrounding the periphery (claim 1) or at least a portion of the periphery (claim 17) of the scintillator. Further, this recited organic film extends at least partially into the gaps formed between the side surfaces of the columnar crystals of the scintillator.

For at least these reasons, Applicants submit that the pending claims patentably distinguish over the applied references of record.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants submit that the pending claims are in condition for allowance, and respectfully request reconsideration and the timely allowance of the pending claims. Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of this response, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative to expedite prosecution. A favorable action is awaited.

Except for issue fees payable under 37 C.F.R. § 1.18, the Commissioner is hereby authorized by this paper to charge any additional fees during the entire pendency of this application including fees due under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 and 1.17 which may be required, including any required extension of time fees, or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-0310.

This paragraph is intended to be a **CONSTRUCTIVE PETITION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME** in accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a)(3).

Respectfully submitted,

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP



John G. Smith
Registration No. 33,818

Dated: July 14, 2003

Customer No. 009629
MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP
1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20004
(202) 739-3000